

ATTACHMENT 1

Manual Data Collection

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Indicator	Indicator	Manual Collection	Manual Calculation	Manual Load	Mechanized Reporting
2	GA-1A	Gateway Availability - Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)			X	
3	GA-1B	Gateway Availability - Fetch and Stuff system			X	
	GA-1C	Gateway Availability - Data Arbiter system			X	
5	GA-2	Gateway Availability - Electronic Data Interchange (EDI)			X	
6	GA-3	Gateway Availability - Electronic Bonding-Trouble Administration (EB-TA)			X	
7	GA-4	Gateway Availability - EXACT			X	
8	PO-8A	Jeopardy Notice Interval for Non-Designed Services - Retail				X
9	PO-8B	Jeopardy Notice Interval for Unbundled Loops and Number Portability process - Retail				X
10	PO-8C	Jeopardy Notice Interval for LIS Trunks - Retail (FGD)				X
11	PO-8D	Jeopardy Notice Interval for UNE-P	X	X	X	
12	PO-9A	Timely Jeopardy Notices for Non-Designed Services -				X
13	PO-9B	Timely Jeopardy Notice for Unbundled Loops and Number Portability process - Retail				X
14	PO-9C	Timely Jeopardy Notice for LIS Trunks - Retail	X	X	X	
15	PO-9D	Timely Jeopardy Notice for UNE-P				X
16	PO-10	LSR Accountability	X	X	X	
17	PO-15	Number of Due Date Changes Per Order				X
18	OP-2	Calls Answered within Twenty Seconds - Interconnect Provisioning Center	X	X	X	
19	OP-7	Coordinated "Hot Cut" Interval - Unbundled Loops	X			
20	OP-8B	Coordinated LNP Timeliness (associated with Loops)	X			
21	OP-8C	Non-Coordinated LNP Triggers Activated on Time	X			
22	OP-13A	Coordinated Cuts On Time (measuring % of all LSRs that are started and completed on time) - Unbundled Loop	X			
23	OP-13B	Coordinated Cuts On Time (measuring % of all LSRs that are actually started without the CLECs approval) - Unbundled Loop	X			
24	MR-2	Calls Answered within 20 seconds - Interconnect Repair Center	X	X	X	
25	MR-8	Trouble Rate - IOF only				X
26	BI-1A	Time To Provide Recorded Usage Records for UNEs and Resale		X	X	
27	BI-1B	Time To Provide Recorded Usage Records for Jointly Provided Switched Access		X	X	
28	BI-2	Invoices Delivered within 10 Days		X	X	
29	BI-3A	Billing Accuracy - Adjustments for Errors on UNE and Resale bills		X	X	
30	BI-3B	Billing Accuracy - Adjustments for Errors on Reciprocal Compensation MOUs	X	X	X	
31	BI-4A	Billing Completeness on UNE and Resale Bills		X	X	
32	BI-4B	Billing Completeness on Reciprocal Compensation MOUs		X	X	
33	DB-1	Time to Update Databases (E911, LIDB & LSS)	X	X	X	
34	DB-2	Accurate Database Updates (E911, LIDB & LSS)	X	X	X	
35	DA-1	Speed of Answer - Directory Assistance	X	X	X	
36	DA-2	Calls Answered Within Ten Seconds-Directory Assistance	X	X	X	
37	OS-1	Speed of Answer - Operator Services	X	X	X	
38	OS-2	Calls Answered Within Ten Seconds-Operator Services	X	X	X	
39	NP-1	NXX Code Activation	X	X	X	
40	CP-1A-1	Installation Interval on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
41	CP-1A-2	Installation Interval on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
42	CP-1B-1	Installation Interval on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
43	CP-1B-2	Installation Interval on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
44	CP-2A-1	Installation Commitments Met on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
45	CP-2A-2	Installation Commitments Met on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
46	CP-2B-1	Installation Commitments Met on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
47	CP-2B-2	Installation Commitments Met on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
48	CP-3A-1	Feasibility Study Interval on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
49	CP-3A-2	Feasibility Study Interval on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
50	CP-3B-1	Feasibility Study Interval on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
51	CP-3B-2	Feasibility Study Interval on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
52	CP-4A-1	Feasibility Study Commitments Met on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
53	CP-4A-2	Feasibility Study Commitments Met on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	

Manual Data Collection

	A	B	C	D	E	F
54	CP-4B-1	Feasibility Study Commitments Met on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
55	CP-4B-2	Feasibility Study Commitments Met on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
6	CP-5A-1	Quote Intervals on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
57	CP-5A-2	Quote Intervals on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
58	CP-5B-1	Quote Intervals on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
59	CP-5B-2	Quote Intervals on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
60	CP-6A-1	Quote Commitments Met on Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
61	CP-6A-2	Quote Commitments Met on Augments to Virtual, Physical Caged and Shared Collocations	X	X	X	
62	CP-6B-1	Quote Commitments Met on Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	
63	CP-6B-2	Quote Commitments Met on Augments to Cageless Collocations	X	X	X	

ATTACHMENT 2

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Non-designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Utah

Feb - May 02 Results
REPAIR



		MR-3	MR-4	MR-6	MR-7	MR-8	MR-9					
Product	Disaggreg.	Out of Svc<24 hrs	All Trbl < 48 hours	Mean Time Restore	Repeat Reports	Trouble Rate	Appointments					
Residence	Dispatch I/ MSAs											
	Dispatch o/MSA											
	No Dispatch											
Business	Dispatch I/ MSAs											
	Dispatch o/MSA							-	-	-	-	-
	No Dispatch											
PBX	Dispatch I/ MSAs						<div></div>					
	Dispatch o/MSA						-	-	-	-	-	
	No Dispatch											<div></div>
Qwest DSL	Zone 1	-	-	-	-							
	Zone 2	-	-	-	-							

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Non-designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Wyoming

Feb - May 02 Results

REPAIR



		MR-3	MR-4	MR-6	MR-7	MR-8	MR-9
Product	Disaggreg.	Out of Svc<24 hrs	All Trbl < 48 hours	Mean Time Restore	Repeat Reports	Trouble Rate	Appointments
Residence	Dispatch I/ MSAs						
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch						
Business	Dispatch I/ MSAs						
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch	-					
Centrex	Dispatch I/ MSAs	-	-	-	-	0.2% - 1.0% 1.0%	-
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch						
Centrex-21	Dispatch I/ MSAs	-	-	-	-		-
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch						
PBX	Dispatch I/ MSAs	-	-	-	-		-
	Dispatch o/MSA	-	-	-	-		-
	No Dispatch	-	-	-	-		-

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Washington

PROVISIONING



Feb - May 02 Results

Product	Categ.	OP-3 Commitments	OP-4 Intervals	OP-5 New Svc Trouble	OP-6A Delays/Non-Facil.	OP-6B Delays/Facilities
Basic ISDN	Zone 1					
	Zone 2	-	-		-	-
Pri ISDN	Zone 1	-	-		-	-
	Zone 2	-	-	-	-	-
DS0	Zone 1					
	Zone 2					
DS1	Zone 1	-	-	0.0% - 75.0% 42.9%	-	-
	Zone 2					
DS3	Zone 1	-	-		-	-
	Zone 2	-	-	-	-	-
Frame Rel.	Zone 1	-	-		-	-
	Zone 2	-	-	-	-	-

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Washington

REPAIR



Feb - May 02 Results

		MR-5	MR-6	MR-7	MR-8
Product	Categ.	Cleared < 4 hours	Mean Time Restore	Repeat Reports	Trouble Rate
Basic ISDN	Zone 1	-	-	-	
	Zone 2	-	-	-	
Pri ISDN	Zone 1	-	-	-	
	Zone 2	-	-	-	
DS0	Zone 1				
	Zone 2				
DS1	Zone 1				4.9% - 9.4%
	Zone 2				7.3%
DS3	Zone 1	-	-	-	-
	Zone 2	-	-	-	
Frame Rel.	Zone 1	-	-	-	-
	Zone 2	-	-	-	

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Non-designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Montana

Feb - May 02 Results
PROVISIONING



		OP-3	OP-4	OP-5	OP-6A	OP-6B
Product	Disaggreg.	Commitments	Intervals	New Svc Trouble	Delays/Non-Facil.	Delays/Facilities
Residence	Dispatch i/MSAs					
	Dispatch o/MSA					
	No Dispatch					
Business	Dispatch i/MSAs					
	Dispatch o/MSA					
	No Dispatch					
Centrex-21	Dispatch i/MSAs					
	Dispatch o/MSA					
	No Dispatch	-	-		-	-

CHECKLIST ITEM 14 - RESALE: Non-designed Products

AT&T Revisions

State: Montana

Feb - May 02 Results

REPAIR



		MR-3	MR-4	MR-6	MR-7	MR-8	MR-9
Product	Disaggreg.	Out of Svc<24 hrs	All Trbl < 48 hours	Mean Time Restore	Repeat Reports	Trouble Rate	Appointments
Residence	Dispatch I/ MSAs						
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch						
Business	Dispatch I/ MSAs						
	Dispatch o/MSA						
	No Dispatch						
Centrex-21	Dispatch I/ MSAs	-	-	-	-		-
	Dispatch o/MSA	-	-	-	-		-
	No Dispatch	-					

ATTACHMENT 3

Montana Results

Measure Type	MISSED, EXCUSE LOW VOLUMES	PASSED, BUT WITH LOW VOLUMES
Diagnostic	0	0
Benchmark	0	14
Parity	1	143
	1	157

Wyoming Results

Measure Type	MISSED, EXCUSE LOW VOLUMES	PASSED, BUT WITH LOW VOLUMES
Diagnostic	0	0
Benchmark	1	17
Parity	7	159
	8	176

Utah Results

Measure Type	MISSED, EXCUSE LOW VOLUMES	PASSED, BUT WITH LOW VOLUMES
Diagnostic	1	2
Benchmark	3	17
Parity	6	192
	10	211

4-State Totals

Measure Type	MISSED, EXCUSE LOW VOLUMES	PASSED, BUT WITH LOW VOLUMES
Diagnostic	1	4
Benchmark	4	58
Parity	30	769
	35	831

Washington Results

Measure Type	MISSED, EXCUSE LOW VOLUMES	PASSED, BUT WITH LOW VOLUMES
Diagnostic	0	2
Benchmark	0	10
Parity	16	275
	16	287

Low Volumes < 30 measured transactions in a month during the 4 months of results

Diagnostic results are from EELs

ATTACHMENT 4

***** BEGIN FORWARDED MESSAGE *****

On 9/14/01 at 7:58 AM Whitney, Kate <kwhitney@state.mt.us> wrote:

<Reasons I don't think it's a good idea to add exclusions for TOK/FOK/NTF
<disposition codes as proposed by Qwest:

<

<1. There is no reason to assume that a trouble report was not legitimate
<just because Qwest is unable to find trouble when it responds to a
<customer's trouble report. I would posit that, in the great majority of
<instances, some problem with phone service prompts a customer to submit a
<trouble report, even if the problem may no longer be present when Qwest
<tests the line or tries to isolate the trouble. Excluding these
<disposition

<codes from these PID results will mean a significant chunk of trouble
<reports are not included in Qwest's performance results. According to data
<Qwest provided to the FCC for ARMIS reports, 29% of residential trouble
<reports and about 35% of business trouble reports regionwide were closed
<out
<to "no trouble found" in 1999, the most recent year shown on the FCC chart.
<<http://www.fcc.gov/ccb/armis/sq/documents/6.pdf> (go to page 2 for Qwest's
<chart)

<

<2. Qwest's proposal to include a TOK/FOK/NTF trouble report in the
<performance results only if the customer reports a trouble in the
<subsequent

<30 days that is found to be caused by a Qwest network problem makes the
<inappropriate assumption that a trouble report for which Qwest is unable to
<find the cause was not a legitimate trouble report unless the customer has
<recurring trouble. It is not necessarily the case that a trouble report
<for
<which Qwest was unable to determine the cause will recur in a month's time,
<or ever.

<

<3. Qwest has said the reason it wants to exclude the TOK, FOK and NTF
<disposition codes is because a few CLECs' results for these PIDs are
<seriously out of whack and Qwest doesn't want to make unwarranted payments
<to them under the QPAP. This is a problem that should be resolved between
<Qwest and the few offending CLECs, instead of adding exclusions to PIDs
<that
<will mean removing legitimate trouble reports from the performance results.
<Additionally, Section 13 of the proposed QPAP provides that Qwest is not
<obligated to make QPAP payments if its non-conformance with a measurement
<is
<due to bad faith acts of a CLEC.

<

<4. Qwest points out that Verizon excludes these disposition codes from its
<performance results. It should be noted that Bell South (in Florida) and
<SWBT (in Texas and presumably its other 271-approved states) do not exclude
<them.

<

<The TAG has agreed that it is appropriate to exclude trouble reports that

<have been found to be caused by the customer's action or equipment. Those
<exclusions are already in place in these PIDs. It is not appropriate to
<exclude trouble reports when Qwest was unable to determine what the problem
<was that prompted the report.

<
<Kate Whitney
<Montana PSC
<

<-----Original Message-----

<From: Michael Williams [mailto:mgwill1@qwest.com]
<Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2001 2:24 PM
<To: roc-tag@psclist.state.mt.us
<Subject: Revised OP-5 & MR-8 PID Proposal
<
<

<TAG MEMBERS:
<

< Attached is a document containing revised draft PID proposals for OP-5
<(New Service Installation Quality) and MR-8 (Trouble Rate). This revision
<depicts how Qwest is enhancing its proposal for handling trouble tickets
<coded to "Test OK," "No Trouble Found," and "Found OK," in these two
<measurements. Specifically, these revisions provide that tickets coded to
<the indicated manner may be excluded only if there is no subsequent trouble
<ticket coded to valid network trouble within 30 days. As we explained in
<prior TAG meetings, Qwest believes these changes are very important to
<proper and fair application of OP-5 and MR-8, particularly in light of
<their inclusion in various PAP proposals.

<Regards,
<Mike Williams
<Qwest
<(See attached file: OP-5 & MR-8 PID 12Sep01DRAFT.doc)
<

***** END FORWARDED MESSAGE *****